

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-39 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office Action dated October 30, 2008, claims 1-39 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

### **Response to Objection to the Specification**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the Specification because of typographical errors in the Specification. Applicants have amended the Specification to correct the typographical errors in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Thus, the objection to the Specification is now moot.

### **Response to Objection to the Claims**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to claim 13 due to the lack of antecedent basis for "the printer" recited in claim 13. Applicants have amended claim 1, from which claim 13 depends, to include "a printer." Thus, "the printer" recited in claim 13 now has sufficient antecedent basis. Therefore, the objection to claim 13 is moot.

### **Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Hoffberg, U.S. Patent No. 6,400,996. This rejection is traversed in view of the amended claims.

Amended claims 1 and 20 respectively recite, *inter alia*, a printer and method for generating media representations of a collection of media programs. Claim 1 is representative.

A printer for generating media representations of a collection of media programs received from a media receiver, the printer comprising:

- a print drive interface for receiving scheduling preferences comprising a media program;
- a control module for setting the media receiver to a channel that includes media program scheduling information;
- an extraction module for extracting, from the channel, scheduling information associated with the media program;
- a processing logic for generating a list of scheduled play times of the media program based on the extracted scheduling information, the list comprising one or more user selectable barcodes for each play time of the media program, wherein each barcode is associated with an action that is performed by the printer responsive to user selection of the barcode;
- a print engine for printing the list of scheduled play times of the media program; and
- a media transfer interface for permitting communication between the printer and the media receiver, the media transfer interface being coupled to the media receiver.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Hoffberg. Hoffberg discloses a pattern recognition system for a multimedia device. *See* Hoffberg, Abstract. Hoffberg discloses a video cassette recorder (VCR) that is capable of receiving user inputted characteristics of program material that are desired by a user. *See* Hoffberg, col. 100, ll. 5-8. Over time, the VCR monitors various broadcast choices and determines which programs match the inputted characteristics for recording purposes. *See* Hoffberg, col. 100, ll. 8-10.

First, Hoffberg's feature extractor is not a corollary to the claimed "extraction module," as asserted by the Examiner. *See* Office Action, pg. 3. Hoffberg's feature extractor does not extract "from [a] channel, **scheduling information** associated with [a] media

program.” Rather, Hoffberg discloses that the feature extractor divides video frames of a program into a number of features including *movement, objects, foreground, or background*. See Hoffberg, col. 100, ll. 62-65. As is clearly evident, none of Hoffberg’s extracted features corresponds to the claimed “scheduling information.” Thus, Hoffberg does not disclose an “extraction module for extracting, from the channel, **scheduling information** associated with the media program.”

Second, Hoffberg does not disclose “a processing logic for generating a list of scheduled play times of the media program based on the extracted scheduling information, the list comprising one or more user selectable barcodes for each play time of the media program, wherein each barcode is associated with an action that is performed by the printer responsive to user selection of the barcode.” As discussed above, Hoffberg fails to disclose extracting scheduling information. Thus, it logically follows that Hoffberg cannot “generat[e] a list of scheduled play times of [a] media program based on the **extracted scheduling information**,” as claimed.

Even assuming *arguendo* that Hoffberg’s extracted features did correspond to the claimed “scheduling information,” Hoffberg still does not disclose “generating a list of scheduled play times of the media program” using the extracted scheduling information. Rather, Hoffberg simply discloses that the extracted features are compared to the characteristics specified by the user to determine whether the program from which the features were extracted is of interest to the user. See Hoffberg, col. 101, ll. 1-8. Thus, Hoffberg does not “generate” anything from the extracted features, much less generate the “list of scheduled play times of the media program.” At best, as noted by the Examiner, Hoffberg records programs of interest. See Hoffberg, col. 92, ll. 8-16. However, the

recorded programs are not a generated “list of scheduled play times of the media program,” as claimed.

Third, assuming *arguendo* that Hoffberg’s recorded programs of interest could be considered a corollary to the claimed “list of scheduled play times of the media program,” there is still no hint, mention or suggestion in Hoffberg that the recorded programs comprise “one or more user selectable barcodes for each play time of the media program.” In the claimed invention, a barcode is “associated with **an action** that is performed by the printer responsive to user selection of the barcode.” In contrast, while Hoffberg does disclose the use of barcodes, the barcodes are merely *attached to a VCR tape to store identification information* related to the content of the tape. See Hoffberg, col. 92, ll. 49-53. At best, as noted by the Examiner, Hoffberg discloses that the VCR may selectively record or display a program, but the actions of recording and displaying are not actions associated with Hoffberg’s barcodes that are “performed by” the VCR, “responsive to user selection of the barcode,” as claimed.

Thus, for at least the reasons described above, claims 1 and 20 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 20.

Claims 10, 15, 19, and 35 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the rejection to claims 10, 15, 19, and 35 is moot.

Claims 2-9, 11-14, 16-18, 21-34, and 36-39 variously depend from claims 1 and 20, shown above to be patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Claims 2-9, 11-14, 16-18, 21-34, and 36-39 are allowable for at least the reasons described above with respect to the independent claims, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

**Request for Consideration of Information Disclosure Statements**  
**Filed in Parent Applications**

Applicants note that this application is a continuation-in-part application of parent applications, U.S. Patent Application Nos. 10/001,895, 10/001,849, 10/001,893, 10/001,894, 10/001,891, 10/175,540, 10/645,821, 10/081,129, 10/701,966, 10/465,027, and 10/174,522. Under MPEP 609.02, the Examiner should consider information which has been considered by the Office in a parent application when examining such (continuation/divisional/continuation-in-part) applications. It is not necessary for the Applicant to submit a duplicative information disclosure statement in the (continuation/divisional/continuation-in-part) application. See MPEP 609.02 and 2001.06(b).

In addition, the Examiner must indicate in the first Office Action whether the prior art in the parent application has been reviewed. See MPEP 2001.06(b). However, there is no such indication in the first Office Action dated October 30, 2008, as to whether the prior art in the parent applications recited above has been reviewed. The Examiner is hereby respectfully requested to consider the information disclosure statements filed in the parent applications recited above, and indicate in the next Office Action whether such information disclosure statements have been considered.

**Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-9, 11-14, 16-18, 20-34, and 36-39 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 28, 2009

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/  
Attorney for Assignee  
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7213  
Fax: (650) 938-5200